



SUMMARY

Wastewater Treatment Workgroup (WWTWG)

Conference Call

Tuesday, May 7th, 2013, 10:00 AM- 12:00 PM

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19148/>

Welcome & Introductions

- Tanya Spano convened the call shortly after 10:00AM. She welcomed participants and reviewed the morning's [agenda](#).

Action Item: Approval of April WWTWG Minutes

- Spano asked for any comments or corrections to the [April minutes](#) as written.
 - None were raised; the minutes were approved.
- **DECISION:** The April conference call minutes were accepted as submitted.

Biosolids

- Mark Dubin (University of Maryland; Agriculture Workgroup Coordinator) described how biosolids are currently reported and integrated in the modeling tools.
 - For more information, view his [presentation](#).
 - He explained Virginia is currently the only jurisdiction that has reported county-specific application of biosolids to the Bay Program. Virginia DEQ passes data to DCR, who submits it to the CBP. As the regulatory agency, DEQ receives the data from the treatment facilities.
 - He noted biosolids have a mineralizable nutrient component, so some nutrients are still available the following year, unlike with chemical fertilizers. So that's one difference in the Watershed Model.
 - The Agriculture Workgroup (AgWG) is investigating new data sources for annual applications of inorganic fertilizer on agricultural land uses.
- Matt Johnston (UMD, CBPO): in some counties, N and P concentrations coming off the land may be higher in absence of biosolids. So if biosolids were applied and reported in other states, there would be increased phosphorous runoff in some counties...
- Ning: if jurisdictions have permits on biosolids, there should be data reported under the permit requirements.
- Mark: Biosolids are a regulated material and applied under a nutrient management plan. The requirements vary by state, but there are typically soil tests, setback requirements, and oversight for the use and application of biosolids.
- Katherine Antos (EPA, CBPO) noted that at the October WQGIT face-to-face meeting, this item was designated as a WWTWG lead. For midpoint assessment... It would make sense for other states to also report, since Virginia is not the only state to generate biosolids.
- Dave Montali (WV DEP): In WV, the land application requirements are designated in the NPDES permit, so it makes sense as a WWTWG issue.
- Johnston: we would not only need to know the tons applied, but would need to know where it is applied, and moisture content, etc. Best professional judgment can be used to estimate the nutrient content.

- Dubin: this could be a similar approach to the Poultry Litter Subcommittee to consistently estimate the annual loads. One suggestion to consider.
- Dubin felt this issue will gain importance as we move forward, due to permit requirements and factors like population growth.
- Montali: See two steps here: 1) take inventory of what is going on in all the states, to see what facilities are land applying and how much. Then, (2) determine how to do progress reporting.
- Montali: there are some septage haulers that may land apply, and some have contracts where the hauler brings the septage to a POTW.
- Ron Furlan (PA DEP) expressed concern about resources to gather this data in Pennsylvania. This data is in the waste management division. He also noted that most biosolids are put down under nutrient management or conservation plans.
- Montali: First step would be for CBPO staff to generate a wish list for states to work from and see what may be possible.
- Johnston: if nutrients are generated in one county, it is assumed that they stay in that county unless there is data to suggest the nutrients were relocated.
- Spano asked for the group's thoughts on the workgroup's next steps.
 - Johnston: Montali requested a list of data needs as a first step. Will provide to the group and start the data collection process to gauge the magnitude of biosolids application.
 - Antos noted EPA is working to renew its national contract for TMDL support, so there will be continued hours available for states to tap into for tasks like this. States can also always use CBRAP funds.
- Spano summarized there is no decision or commitment from the workgroup at this point, but we can queue this up for subsequent discussion at a later date.
- **ACTION:** WWTWG members can send follow-up questions or comments to Ning, Jeremy, Matt, and Mark.
- **ACTION:** CBPO staff will provide the states with a draft wish list of data needs for biosolids.

Spray Irrigation

- Dubin noted the AgWG will be looking at irrigation systems as a BMP. We have an interim BMP for irrigated cropland.
- Denorah Dalmasy (MDE) described Maryland's spray irrigation program, data, and requirements.
 - View the [presentation](#) for more information.
 - Must have 60 days of storage, not allowed to discharge during the winter.
 - There are 33 spray irrigation facilities in Maryland.
 - She reviewed Maryland's typical permit requirements for spray irrigation.
 - Starting in 2008 the state is including nutrient limits for effluent.
 - Believed the number of WWTPs converting to spray irrigation will increase.
- Allen Brockenbrough (VA DEQ) described Virginia's program [verbal only, no presentation].
 - Virginia's program has requirements similar to Maryland.
 - Within the next year, will be down to 9 spray irrigation facilities with under one MGD of flow.

- DEQ receives monthly reports from the facilities, but do not currently have the data compiled in a central database. So there would be effort to extract the data for reporting to CBP.
- Ron Graeber (DE DNREC) described Delaware's spray irrigation program requirements and data.
 - View his [presentation](#) for more details
 - Ground water and soil monitoring are required under permit
 - Permitted land treatment systems submit annual reports that include the total volume of water applied and TN and TP applied per acre.
- Spano noted the time and asked for the workgroup to revisit and conclude this discussion next month.

Methods to address wastewater implementation lag issue

- Greg Busch (MDE) presented Maryland's proposal for addressing wastewater implementation lag time issue. Maryland sought the workgroup's views on if the approach is technically sound and consistent with the policies and goals of the partnership. Maryland seeks the workgroup's recommendation on the issue to the WQGIT.
 - View the [presentation](#) for details.
 - Busch noted that within a month of upgrade to ENR, 70% of facilities are meeting the nutrient concentrations designed for.
- Busch: For greater consistency between point and nonpoint sectors, Maryland suggests a reporting option for facilities to receive full credit for ENR in the year the upgrade is completed [slides 5-7].
- Antos: is MD proposing to submit this information instead of how it currently reports data through DMRs? Or would this replace the supplemental indicator?
 - Bush: this would enhance DMR progress reporting. If an upgrade goes online that year, the ENR limit would replace the DMR levels during that reporting year.
- Antos: So the loads from upgraded facilities would be based on the ENR limit rather than the DMR reports.
 - Busch: Correct.
- Antos: this proposal could be ignoring facilities operating below design flow that may be discharging at higher concentrations while still in compliance.
- Brockenbrough: For next month, suggest Maryland includes a tweak that accounts for flow differences.
 - Busch: still working on that. It is a little more complicated than the lag time issue.
- Spano asked for other lingering questions, noting the workgroup may need more time to discuss this at a later date.
 - Brockenbrough: Would appreciate this proposal more as a supplemental indicator than as the actual data fed into the progress runs. The Bay Program has taken flak before for using modeled, rather than actual flows, so that is one concern with the proposed approach.
 - Dharmendra Kumar (PA DEP): [Comment via Adobe Connect] Still unclear why we want to make point sources consistent to NPS. I think it would be wrong way. We should put efforts to make NPS consistent with Point sources by removing as much as of estimation with real data if we can.

- Antos: concern that this approach could potentially underestimate total wastewater loads. Could make sense as a supplemental indicator, but as Brockenbrough pointed out the CBP has taken flack for using modeled rather than measured loads.
 - Busch: Maryland would like to see an indicator that displays the amount of load reductions resulting from management actions.
- Spano noted the time and the need for continued discussion on this issue. Will key this up for next conference call. She asked Maryland to provide information needed for the group to make a decision.
 - Busch noted they are also working on proposal for how to handle precipitation, which Maryland considers a separate issue than implementation lag-time. We could revisit the implementation lag-time issue next month, and perhaps precipitation the following month.

Updates

- Vic D'Amato (Tetra Tech): we have the first draft of the final report for the septic panel and are refining it. The goal is to deliver the panel's recommendations for the June WWTWG call.
- Spano encouraged members to attend the June meeting if possible.

Adjourned

Next meeting:

Tuesday, June 4th, 2013

10:00AM – 3:00PM

CBPO Joe Macknis Memorial Conference Room (Fish Shack)

410 Severn Avenue, Suite 117

Annapolis, MD 21403

<http://www.chesapeakebay.net/calendar/event/19149/>

Teleconference Participants

<u>Name</u>		<u>Affiliation</u>
Tanya	Spano, Chair	Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments
Ning	Zhou, Coord.	Virginia Tech, CBPO
Jeremy	Hanson, Staff	CRC, CBPO
Katherine	Antos	EPA, CBPO
Brian	Ashby	Delaware DNREC
Allan	Brockenbrough	Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Greg	Bush	MDE
Denorah	Dalmasy	MDE
Vic	D'Amato	Tetra Tech
Ron	Entringer	NYS DEC
Ron	Furlan	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
Ron	Graeber	Delaware DNREC
Joyce	Hudson	EPA
Matt	Johnston	University of Maryland, CBPO
Dharmendra	Kumar	Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection
David	Montali	West Virginia Dept. of Environmental Protection
Jay	Prager	Maryland Dept. of Environment
Jeff	Sweeney	EPA, CBPO
Suzanne	Trevena	EPA, Region 3
John	Weidman	New York State Dept. of Environmental Conservation